



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/987,955	11/16/2001	Alok K. Saxena	65187-209	7880

22504 7590 04/18/2007
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP
2600 CENTURY SQUARE
1501 FOURTH AVENUE
SEATTLE, WA 98101-1688

EXAMINER

TRAN, NGHI V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2151

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/987,955

Applicant(s)

SAXENA ET AL.

Examiner

Nghi V. Tran

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01/24/2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3,5-7,9,10,13-18,21-30 and 32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-7,9-10,13-18,21-30 and 32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on January 24, 2007. Claims 1, 7, 9, 17, 25, and 32 have been amended. Claims 4, 8, 11-12, 19-20, and 31 have been canceled. Therefore, claims 1-3, 5-10, 13-18, 21-30, and 32 are presented for further examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-10, 13-18, 21-30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonsson et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,700,888 (hereinafter Jonsson), in view of Svanbro et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,680,921 (hereinafter Svanbro).

4. With respect to claims 1, 7, 9, 17, 25, and 32, Jonsson teaches a call context processor [figure 1], comprising:

- a header extractor [i.e. header extractor 22] configured to extract a header from information extracted from initial call establishment negotiation [col.4, ln.5-19];

Art Unit: 2151

- a header compressor [i.e. Header Compression Node 18] configured to compress relevant portions of the extracted header [col.4, ln.1-4 and col.4, lns.21-39]; and
- an identification module configured to establish context identification using the compressed relevant portions of the header [col.1, ln.58 - col.2, ln.25].

However, Jonsson does not explicitly show a header compressor configured to compress only relevant portions of the extracted header, the relevant portions comprising a payload type header field.

In a call context processor, Svanbro clearly suggests or discloses a header compressor configured to compress only relevant portions [i.e. time stamp compression] of the extracted header [fig.3 and col.4, ln.8 - col.5, ln.50], the relevant portions comprising other fields [i.e. item 32, of fig.3].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Jonsson in view of Svanbro by compressing only relevant portions because this feature provides techniques for efficiently compressing and reconstructing the time stamp value of real time communication packet whose time stamp value does not fall within a normally expected sequence of time stamp values [Svanbro, col.2, lns30-34]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify in order to minimize the necessary bandwidth for information carried in packet headers on a per hop basis over point-to-point links [Svanbro, col.1, lns.12-14].

Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify by including a payload type header field in the other fields.

5. With respect to claims 2, 10, and 18, Jonsson does not explicitly show the identification module associates the context identification with a bearer channel of a call established from the initial call establishment negotiation.

In a call context processor, Svanbro discloses the identification module associates the context identification with a bearer channel of a call established from the initial call establishment negotiation [col.3, ln.22 - col.4, ln.24].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Jonsson in view of Svanbro by associating the context identification with a bearer channel of a call established from the initial call establishment negotiation because this feature provides techniques for efficiently compressing and reconstructing the time stamp value of real time communication packet whose time stamp value does not fall within a normally expected sequence of time stamp values [Svanbro, col.2, lns30-34]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify in order to minimize the necessary bandwidth for information carried in packet headers on a per hop basis over point-to-point links [Svanbro, col.1, lns.12-14].

Art Unit: 2151

6. With respect to claims 5, 13, and 21, Jonsson further teaches the header being an RTP, UDP, IP header [col.1, Ins.13-34].

7. With respect to claims 6, 16, 24, and 28, Jonsson is silent on the call context processor extracts information by processing a create connection message and an associated session data protocol header from the initial call establishment negotiation.

In a call context processor, Svanbro discloses the call context processor extracts information by processing a create connection message and an associated session data protocol header from the initial call establishment negotiation [col.3, ln.22 - col.4, ln.24 and col.1, ln.21 - col.2, ln.13].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Jonsson in view of Svanbro by processing a create connection message and an associated session data protocol header from the initial call establishment negotiation because this feature provides techniques for efficiently compressing and reconstructing the time stamp value of real time communication packet whose time stamp value does not fall within a normally expected sequence of time stamp values [Svanbro, col.2, Ins30-34]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify in order to minimize the necessary bandwidth for information carried in packet headers on a per hop basis over point-to-point links [Svanbro, col.1, Ins.12-14].

8. With respect to claims 14 and 22, Jonsson further teaches extracting information from initial call establishment negotiation, and establishing the context identification are performed at a base of a transmission network [col.3, ln.33 - col.4, ln.30]

9. With respect to claims 15 and 23, Jonsson further teaches a remote unit accesses the base via airlink [col.3, lns.40-52].

10. With respect to claims 3, 26-27, and 29, Jonsson does not explicitly show the compressed relevant portion of the extracted header will be transmitted to a remote unit with a payload wherein the header compressor not compressing portions of the header that will not be transmitted to the remote unit with the payload.

In a call context processor, Svanbro discloses the compressed relevant portion of the extracted header will be transmitted to a remote unit with a payload wherein the header compressor not compressing portions of the header that will not be transmitted to the remote unit with the payload [fig.3 and col.4, ln.8 - col.5, ln.50].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Jonsson in view of Svanbro by compressing only relevant portions because this feature provides techniques for efficiently compressing and reconstructing the time stamp value of real time communication packet whose time stamp value does not fall within a normally expected sequence of time stamp values [Svanbro, col.2, lns30-34]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify in order

to minimize the necessary bandwidth for information carried in packet headers on a per hop basis over point-to-point links [Svanbro, col.1, lns.12-14].

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed January 24, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following reasons: Jonsson teaches a call context processor [figure 1], comprising: a header extractor [i.e. header extractor 22] configured to extract a header from information extracted from initial call establishment negotiation [col.4, ln.5-19]; a header compressor [i.e. Header Compression Node 18] configured to compress relevant portions of the extracted header [col.4, ln.1-4 and col.4, lns.21-39]; and an identification module configured to establish context identification using the compressed relevant portions of the header [col.1, ln.58 - col.2, ln.25]. However, Jonsson does not explicitly show a header compressor configured to compress only relevant portions of the extracted header, the relevant portions comprising a payload type header field. In a call context processor, Svanbro clearly suggests or discloses a header compressor configured to compress only relevant portions [i.e. time stamp compression] of the extracted header [fig.3 and col.4, ln.8 - col.5, ln.50], the relevant portions comprising other fields [i.e. item 32, of fig.3]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Jonsson in view of Svanbro by compressing only relevant portions because this feature provides techniques for efficiently compressing and reconstructing the time stamp value of real time communication packet whose time stamp value does not fall within a

Art Unit: 2151

normally expected sequence of time stamp values [Svanbro, col.2, Ins30-34]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify in order to minimize the necessary bandwidth for information carried in packet headers on a per hop basis over point-to-point links [Svanbro, col.1, Ins.12-14]. Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify by including a payload type header field in the other fields.

12. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F. 2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F. 2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Applicant obviously attacks references individually without taking into consideration based on the teaching of combinations of references as show in the above.

13. In response to applicant's argument that Jonsson teaches directly away from the claimed invention. The examiner respectfully does not agree because Jonsson teaches a way, not teaching away from the claimed invention.

14. In response to applicant's argument that Svanbro does not teach or suggest any technique by which less than the entire header is transferred to a remote unit. The Examiner respectfully does not agree because Svanbro discloses conventional

Art Unit: 2151

compression schemes for RTP/UDP/IP header which is less than the entire header is transferred to a remote unit [col.1, ln.11 through col.2, ln.41].

15. Therefore, the examiner asserts that cited prior arts teach or suggest the subject matter broadly recited in independent claims. Claims 2-3, 5-11, 13-19, 21-30 and 32 are rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims and by other reasons set forth above. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-19, 21-30 and 32 are respectfully rejected as shown above.

Conclusion

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nghi V. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-4067. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nghi Tran
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2151

April 16, 2007


KHANH DINH
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100